

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9 11, and 12 have been amended. Claims 16-19 have been added. No claims have been canceled.

The Examiner objected to the specification due to an informality. Specifically, the Examiner pointed to page 16, line 15, stating that the phrase “anda storage unit” should be “and a storage unit”. The Examiner also objected to Claim 9, which is where this phrase appears at page 16, line 15. Applicants have amended Claim 9 to overcome the Examiner’s objection. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the objection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9, and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner specified that certain language is not described in the specification. The Examiner provided an example of the alleged unsupported language in Claim 1 where it recites “if regions are fixed in size and an image is not divisible into the regions”. Applicants have amended Claim 1 and other independent claims have similar language to overcome the rejection. That is, Claim 1 has been amended to replace the phrase cited by the Examiner with “if an image is not evenly divisible into a number of fixed size regions that are equivalently sized”. Similar language was added to the other independent claims rejected by the Examiner. No new matter was added. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims set forth in clear and concise language and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, has been overcome by the amendments and the remarks. Applicants submit that claims 1-9, and 11-15 as amended are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9, and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 9 11, and 12 to more clearly set forth the invention. For example, the Examiner stated that an image can always be divisible into a number of regions or tiles. In view of this, Applicant has amended the claims to set forth that the size of an image is adjusted if an image is not evenly divisible into a number of fixed size regions that are equivalently sized, and that the adjustment is so that the size-adjusted image becomes evenly divisible into the regions. The Examiner also stated that the term “regions” is not well-defined. Applicant respectfully submits that the term uses its ordinary meaning and one skilled in the art would recognize such a term would mean parts of the image such as, for example, tiles. Therefore, Applicant submits that the use of the term “regions” is not indefinite. Even so, Applicant has added Claims 16-19 to set forth that the regions are tiles. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome by the amendments and the remarks. Applicants submit that claims 1-9, and 11-15 as amended are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Satoh, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,895,120). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 as amended is as follows:

An image processing apparatus, comprising:
a size adjusting unit to, if an image is not evenly divisible into a number of fixed size regions that are equivalently sized, adjust the size of the image at a stage in an encoding process to form a size-adjusted image so that the size-adjusted image becomes evenly divisible into the regions; and

an encoding unit to encode the size-adjusted image by the regions into a codestream. (emphasis added)

As set forth above, Claim 1 requires a size adjusting unit that adjusts the size of an image if the image is not even divisible into a number of regions that are fixed in size and are the same size. The adjustment to the image causes the image to be evenly divisible into regions. These features are clearly absent in Satoh.

Satoh discloses a coding scheme in which images are divided into tiles that are coded separately. The tiles are rectangular in size. The Examiner states that Satoh discloses a size-adjusting unit because it discloses the JPEG 2000 decoding standard. The Examiner points to col. 1, line 55 to col. 3, line 7 and col. 11, lines 33-65. However, none of these citations discuss being unable to divide an image into fixed and equally size regions. The Background of the Invention in Satoh does not disclose how to accommodate tiling where the size of the tiles do not permit an image to have the same size tiles cover the entire image. Furthermore, the discussion in Satoh regarding col. 11, lines 33-65 involves context models and not tiling. Other independent claims include substantially similar limitations. In view of this, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention as claimed is not anticipated by Satoh.

Furthermore, Claim 10 is as follows:

An image decoding apparatus, comprising:
a decoding unit to decode a codestream into a size-adjusted image; and
an inverse size adjusting unit to re-adjust the size of the size-adjusted image
at a stage in a decoding process to form an original image based on information related to the size of the original image attached to the codestream.

As set forth above, Claim 10 requires decoding a codestream to produce a size adjusted image and then re-adjusting the size of that image. Satoh does not disclose such a

process. Clearly, Satoh discloses decoding data to produce an image, but after that image is produced, Satoh does not adjust its size. In view of this, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 10 is not anticipated by Satoh.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and 102(e) have been overcome by the amendments and the remarks. Applicants submit that claims 1-15 as amended and Claims 16-19 as added are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 10/6/03

By: 
Michael J. Mallie
Reg. No. 36,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(408) 720-8300